1 2

3

4 5

6

8

7

10

11

12

9

13 14

15

16 17

18 19

20 21

23 24

22

25 26

28

27

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ERIC VOLK,

Plaintiff,

v.

KILOLO KIJAKAZI,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:20-cv-00738-DJA

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff Eric Volk's Motion to Extend Time (ECF No. 25), filed on October 20, 2021. Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, requests an extension of 45 days within which to respond to the Answer filed on October 5, 2021. Plaintiff explains that counsel for Defendant agreed to the extension and attaches his emails with her consent.

Pro se parties are held to less stringent standards than those represented by counsel. *See* Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 20 (1972). Courts also liberally construe pro se filings. See Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep't, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990). Under Local Rule IA 6-1(a), a motion to extend time must state the reasons for the extension requested and must inform the court of all previous extensions of the subject deadline the court granted. LR IA 6-1(a).

Here, the Court liberally construes Plaintiff's request for an extension of time to respond to the Answer as a request for an extension of the time to file a motion as laid out in this Court's scheduling order (ECF No. 24). The Court also finds good cause to grant the extension. Plaintiff has demonstrated hardship that he has experienced making it difficult to meet deadlines. He has demonstrated diligence in reaching out to opposing counsel to request an extension. This request also appears to be his first. The Court thus finds good cause to grant the request.

ORDER IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff Eric Volk's Motion to Extend Time (ECF No. 25) is granted. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff must file his motion as laid out in this Court's scheduling order (ECF No. 24) within 45 days of this Order – by Monday, December 13, 2021. DATED: October 27, 2021. DANIEL J. ALBREGTS UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE